REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-26 are pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance.

IDS Documents

In response to the outstanding action, Applicants submit copies of various documents which were indicated as "missing" from the IDS (documents which were listed, but the text was asserted as not included in the supporting documentation). Attached are copies of the following documents noted in the Action dated December 16, 2005. Removal of the objection and consideration of the references is respectfully requested.

§ 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altova, Users Reference Manual Version 4.4 XML Spy Suite 4.4, Altova Ges. mbH & Altova, Inc., May 4, 2002 (hereinafter "Altova") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,412,772 to Monson, L. (hereinafter "Monson"). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 in-part recites a method for upgrading documents for processing functionality, including

- inputting a structured document having particular editing controls associated therewith into a particular version of the processing functionality;

• determining whether each of the particular editing controls matches a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality; and

• modifying the particular editing controls of the input structured document so that the particular editing controls match the set of expected editing controls to thereby provide a modified structured document

The Office is correct that Altova fails to teach all the above features. However, the Office's citation of Monson as correcting these deficiencies is incorrect. The Monson reference simply teaches a system for permitting the viewing of an object in two different operating system environments. Monson, Abstract and Monson, Col. 3-4. Nowhere does the Monson reference teach or suggest the above method which is capable of modifying the particular editing controls . . . so that the particular editing controls match the set of expected editing controls to thereby provide a modified structured document.

The Monson reference also fails to "determine whether each of the particular editing controls matches a set of expected editing controls. . ." Monson does not teach or suggest this ability as all Monson is concerned (solely) with is taking an object (such as a textual group) and making that object viewable in a different operating system environment.

Additionally, Monson does not have the capability of "modifying the particular editing controls". Instead, Monson is solely trying to provide the capability of presenting an object in a different environment. Monson only discloses that an arbitrary graphical view item may be placed in the "window." Monson, Col. 3, line 55 through Col. 4, line 4. This fails to teach the recited features as the Monson reference fails to teach or disclose inputting a structured

document having particular editing controls, determining whether each of the particular editing controls matches a set of expected editing controls and modifying the particular editing controls of the input structured document. Altova in-view of Monson does not teach these features. Rather, one reading Altova/Monson would be instructed to utilize "user selected" graphical view items. The asserted combination does not teach or suggest the presently recited language. The Altova/Monson combination only teaches utilizing arbitrary graphical view items which have been predefined by a system administrator. Monson, Col. 4, lines 14-15. In other words, Monson modifies Altova by teaching that a person, such as a system administrator, may arbitrarily insert graphical view items. Monson, Col. 6, lines 21-35. Therefore, in the Altova/Monson combination, the end user is "stuck" with the arbitrary decision in comparison to the currently recited features. The Altova/Monson combination fails to disclose inputting, determining and modifying and therefore does not obviate the claim language. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 2 is allowable based on its dependency from Claim 1. Moreover, nowhere does the Altova/Monson combination teach or suggest transforming the modified structured document . . . displaying the other document suitable for presentation using the processing functionality. Altova and Monson fail to transform a modified structured document. Instead the Altova/Monson combination only includes arbitrary graphical view items and does not meet the features of the present method. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claims 3 and 4 are allowable based on their dependency from Claim 1. Additionally, Claims 3 and 4 are allowable for based on the individual claim's own recited features which are not disclosed by Altova/Monson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection to the claims withdrawn.

Claim 5 is allowable based on its dependency from Claim 2. The Altova/Monson combination fails to teach, among other features, displaying the other document for presentation using the processing functionality to provide a displayed document. Additionally, the cited portion of Altova fails to teach the other document suitable for presentation is expressed in a markup language that uses tags pertaining to visual features associated with the presentation of the other document. The cited Altova passages fail to teach this feature. Rather, the cited portion of Altova requires an underlying XSL file. Altova, Page 70. The recited method overcomes this short-coming in the Altova reference. Claim 5 in-part recites wherein the other document suitable for presentation is expressed in a markup language that uses tags. As Altova fails to teach or suggest the foregoing feature the combination does not teach each and every limitation as required. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Ryoka*, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). *See also In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Removal of the pending rejection is requested as the Altova/Monson fails to teach wherein the other document suitable for presentation is expressed in a markup language that uses tags . . . Allowance of Claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 is allowable based on the same rationale as claim 5. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested, and allowance is solicited.

Claim 7 is allowable based on its dependency from Claim 1, which is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claim 7 is additionally allowable as neither the cited passage of Altova nor anywhere does the Altova/Monson references teach modifying, as recited in Claim 1, using an upgrade module that provides a transformation function using extensible stylesheet language (XSL). The references only teach XSL conversion rather than the recited methodology. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 8 is allowable based on the same rationale as claim 1. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 9 is allowable based on its dependency from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully note that the term "node set" as asserted in the pending Action does not appear in Claim 9. Claim 9 in-part recites "wherein the determining of whether each of the particular editing controls matches a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality . . ." Altova/Monson does not teach this feature as Monson, asserted as correcting the defects in Altova, simply teaches the utilization of arbitrary graphical view items. As a result of this teaching, Monson does not match a set of expected editing controls as only arbitrary selections are made. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is further allowable over it base Claim 9 as Altova in view of Monson fails to teach "copying editing control content from the input structured document into corresponding created editing controls in the modified structured document . . ." The citation of the Altova passage, in the rejection of Claim 10, is incorrect as the Office's rejection of Claim 1 specifically notes that it relies on Monson for the asserted teaching of modifying of editing controls. The entirety of the Office's argument under 103(a) is based on the need for Monson to correct the deficiency in Altova. Neither the cited passage of Altova nor Monson teach the "copying editing control content from the input structured document into corresponding created editing controls in the modified structured document . . ." As noted previously, Monson only teaches arbitrary insertion of graphical view items rather than copying. Based on this teaching, the Office's argument fails as the arbitrarily selected graphical items could not be copied as previously described. Removal of the pending rejection is specifically requested.

Claims 11 and 12 are allowable as nowhere does the Altova/Monson combination teach "determining whether the input structured document lacks editing controls. . ." (Claim 11) or "creating new editing controls . . . providing that the new editing controls are required in the particular version of the processing functionality . . ." (Claim 12). Altova/Monson does not teach this as this would be in contradiction to the arbitrary Monson system in which a system administrator selects graphical view items.

Claim 13 is allowable based on its dependency from Claim 1. Claim 13 is additionally allowable as nowhere in the cited passage of Altova or anywhere in

Altova or the other reference are expected editing controls specified by a schema. The cited passage of Altova does not disclose editing controls. The Altova passage, pages 186-188, simply teaches identifying data types in textual data and not editing controls as asserted. The Office's own rejection is based on the inclusion of Monson to correct the failure of Altova to teach "editing controls". Quite simply, Altova discloses identifying data types in textual data, i.e., identifying 8/1/2006 as a date. This disclosure does not directly or impliedly teach "editing controls" as asserted by the Office's argument. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 14 in-part recites "wherein the expected editing controls are specified by some information other than a schema associated with the particular version of the processing functionality." Claim 14 is allowable as the Monson reference does not utilize "some information other than a schema" because, Monson is an arbitrary assignment, in which no information is utilized. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is solicited.

Claims 15 and 16 are allowable based on their dependency from Claim 1. Claims 15 and 16 are additionally allowable as neither the cited portion of the Altova reference nor anywhere in Altova/Monson reference is a document corresponding "to a markup language document generated by an earlier version of the processing functionality compare to the particular version" disclosed. The cited passage simply identifies the version of the document and does not restrict the input structured document . . . by an earlier version of the processing functionality compared to the particular version. This is to say, Altova does not teach this feature as Altova merely

permits version identification rather than the recited methodology. The same is true for Claim 16. "[I]t is necessary to ascertain whether the prior art teachings would appear to be sufficient to one of ordinary skill in the art to suggest making the claimed substitution or other modification." *In re Lalu*, 747 F.2d 703, 223 USPQ 1257, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance of Claims 15 and 16 is solicited.

Claim 17 is allowable based on the same rationale as Claim 1. As the Altova/Monson combination fails to teach modifying as recited in Claim 1, the combination of Altova and Monson fails to teach or suggest using an upgrade module . . . which is developed without knowledge of any requirements of any input structured document (to perform modifying). Monson does not need this upgrade module as the selection is arbitrary. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 18 is allowable as depending from an independent Claim 1 which is in a condition for allowance. Claim 18 in part recites,

• creating new editing controls in the modified structured document providing that the new editing controls are lacking in the input structured document and providing that the new editing controls are required in the particular version of the processing functionality.

Nowhere does Altova/Monson teach or suggest creating new editing controls as recited. The Monson reference, asserted for this teaching, fails to teach the features of Claim 18. Monson discloses that graphical view items are selected by a user. Monson, Col. 6, lines 21-40. The selection is to occur in an arbitrary

manner, such as by a user "dragging and dropping" the item. Thus, selection of the particular Monson graphical view items is conducted without regard for the necessity of the item. For example, through inadvertence, a user may forego a graphical view item which is required in the particular version of the processing functionality. As a result of this inadvertence, the resultant view, in Monson, may be deficient. In light of the foregoing, Altova/Monson fail to teach each and every feature and thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness does not exist. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 19 is allowable as Altova in view of Monson fails to teach the recited features. Monson, cited as correcting the deficiencies with respect to editing controls, fails to teach or suggest "omitting from the modified structured document existing editing controls in the input structured document that are not required in the particular version of the processing functionality." Monson does not implement a method having this feature as a system administrator is relied on to select the graphical view items to utilized in the resultant view. As such, the Monson system does not include the functionality of omitting . . . editing controls which are not required. The Monson system relies solely on the discretion of the person selecting the items and is therefore subject to the inclusion of items which are not required. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Independent **Claim 20** stands rejected over Altova in view of Monson. The Applicants disagree. Applicants respectfully note that Claim 20 is directed

(generally to) a method for generating an upgrade module and includes features which differ from Claim 1. Claim 20 in part recites,

• determining whether a particular version of the processing functionality has been created that warrants generation of the upgrade module; and

• generating the upgrade module if the creation of the particular version warrants the generation of the upgrade module, wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular editing controls associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality.

Altova in view of Monson fails to teach determining whether a particular version of the processing functionality . . . warrants generation of the upgrade module and generating the upgrade module . . . wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular editing controls associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality. Monson, asserted as correcting the deficiencies in Altova, does not teach these features. Monson discloses a system in which human intervention is required to select view items for the resultant view. The Monson items are selected in an arbitrary manner. Monson, Col. 6, lines 21-40 "A user may select and position a view item by a method know in the art (e.g., "clicking" on an item using a mouse, and "dragging" the item to the desired position in the window). Monson Col. 3 line 64. Nowhere does the Monson reference teach or suggest the utilization of an upgrade module wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular editing

controls associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality. The Monson disclosure is limited to providing a system for permitting view of textual objects in various operating system environments and does not disclose the generating of an update module as described. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claims 21-23 are allowable based on their dependency from Claim 20. Additionally, each of the claims recite features which are not disclosed in the prior art. With regard to Claim 22, nowhere does Altova or Monson teach or disclose an upgrade module which "is configured to create new editing controls in the input structured document such that the updated document conforms to the set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality." Monson does not teach this feature. Instead, Monson allows the user to arbitrarily select view items to be "dragged and dropped" in the view. Monson Col. 3 line 64. This fails to teach or suggest the recited feature as Monson does not teach conforming "to the set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality."

Claim 23 is additionally allowable as nowhere does Monson teach omitting editing controls . . . such that the updated document conforms to the set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality. The Monson reference does not teach this feature. Instead, Monson teaches that a user, such as a system administrator, should arbitrarily select visual items for inclusion in the view. In Monson, no consideration is made for conforming the view items to expected items. As Monson does not correct this

deficiency in Altova a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist and the rejection is untenable. Removal of the pending rejection to Claims 21-23 is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Independent **Claim 24** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Altova in view of Monson. The Applicants disagree. Claim 24 generally recites an apparatus for processing documents and includes features which differ from those included in Claim 1. Claims 24 in part recites,

• an upgrade module configured to modify an input structured document having particular features associated therewith so that the input structured document conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with a particular version of the apparatus, to thereby produce a modified structured document; and

• a transformation module configured to transform the modified structured document into another document suitable for presentation.

The Altova/Monson combination fails to teach these features. The asserted combination does not include an upgrade module nor do either of the references include a transformation module. Monson solely relies on the arbitrary decision of a user, such as a system administrator, to select view items. In light of this teaching, Monson does not correct the deficiency in Altova because there is no need for either an upgrade module or a transformation module as the view items are arbitrarily selected by the system administrator. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Independent Claim 25 is allowable as neither the Altova reference nor the Monson reference alone or in combination establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants disagree with the pending rejection. Claim 25 differs from Claim 20 and is separately patentable. Claim 25 is directed generally to an apparatus while Claim 20 is directed to a method. Claim 25 in part recites,

• logic configured to determine whether a particular version of the processing functionality has been created that warrants generation of the upgrade module; and

• logic configured to generate the upgrade module if the creation of the particular version warrants the generation of the upgrade module, wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular editing controls associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the processing functionality.

The combination of Altova in view of Monson fails to teach these features. Rather, one reading Altova/Monson would be instructed to utilize arbitrary selection to insert view items instead of an apparatus including logic configured to determine whether a particular version of the processing functionality has been created that warrants generation of the upgrade module. Monson also fails to disclose an apparatus including logic configured to generate the upgrade module if the creation of the particular version warrants the generation of the upgrade module. The Monson reference is directed to permitting presentation of a "familiar" user defined view and is inconsistent with the features of Claim 20. Monson, Abstract and Monson Col. 6 lines, 10-16. At no time does Monson suggest conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with the particular version of the

processing functionality. The features of the instant claim are contrary to Monson as the claim recites conforming expected editing controls with the particular version of the processing functionality while Monson teaches that view items may be arbitrarily selected. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 26 is an independent claim and recites features which differ from those recited in Claim 1 including an upgrade module and a transformation module. Neither of the foregoing features are recited in Claim 1 thus the reference to the rejection of Claim 1 is without merit. The Applicants disagree with the pending rejection. Claim 26 in part recites,

• an upgrade module information structure configured to modify an input structured document having particular editing controls associated therewith so that the input structured document conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with a particular version of a processing apparatus, to thereby produce a modified structured document; and

• a transformation module information structure configured to transform the modified structured document into another document suitable for presentation. As discussed previously, the asserted combination of Altova/Monson fails to teach or suggest computer readable medium having stored thereon an information structure including an upgrade module information structure. . . so that the input structured document conforms to a set of expected editing controls associated with a particular version of a processing apparatus. Instead, Monson, asserted as correcting the primary Altova reference, teaches a system in which users can select view items in order to have a "familiar" view. The Monson system makes

no provision for conforming expected controls associated with a particular version of a processing apparatus. Monson teaches away from this capability as the Monson system is attempting to utilize a system administrator selected window for the various users instead of utilizing computer readable medium having stored thereon an information structure including an upgrade module information structure as recited. In the asserted Altova/Monson combination, a user is permitted to have an arbitrarily selected view which is familiar instead of implementing computer readable media in accordance with the present claim. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8/1/16

By: _William J. Breen III_
William J. Breen III
Reg. No. 45,313
(509) 324-9256 x249